

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,203	01/28/2004	Chester T. Przygoda JR.	68,127-022	3163
27305	7590 06/29/2005		EXAM	INER
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C. THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101 39400 WOODWARD AVENUE			MULLEN, THOMAS J	
			L DT LD VIT	D. DED MUNICIPA
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLOOMFIEL	BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151		2632	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ø/				
-	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/766,203	PRZYGODA, CHESTER T.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas J. Mullen, Jr.	2632				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa						
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 57-69 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 57-69 is/are rejected. 						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
<u> </u>						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and accomposition and accomposition and accomposition is accomposition and accomposition and accomposition and accomposition are accomposition. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	cepted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
		•				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/21/04.

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

6) Other: _

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ___

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/766,203 Page 2

Art Unit: 2632

1. The patent number associated with parent application 10/091,858 (US 6717517) should be inserted on page 1 of the specification in the appropriate place.

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3. Claims 57-69 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,517, or in the alternative over claims 1 and 4-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,389. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all of the claim limitations found in the present application were previously set forth in the claims of the '517 and '389 (with only minor differences in scope, if any, between the corresponding limitations), and such limitations were combined in essentially the same manner to form a complete "system" and "method" for monitoring and tracking a "container" or "item" (in the '389 patent) in an environment. It is noted that claims 57-59 herein, taken together, generally correspond to claim 1 in either the '517 or the '389 patent.
- 4. Claims 61-65 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 61 and 65, "the controller computer" and "the central computer facility" (at least one occurrence of each term appearing in each claim) lack antecedent basis; note that these

Art Unit: 2632

terms do not appear in independent claim 57, but instead are found in claims 58 and 59, respectively.

- 5. No rejection of claims 57-69 under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 is considered appropriate at this time.
- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The art cited by applicant has been considered. Ghaffari et al (US 5708423), Horwitz et al (US 6496806), Barrett (US 4471345), Palmer et al (US 5942977) and Francis et al (US 6600418) were cited in the parent application (note that Francis et al, US 6600418, is the "patent" equivalent of Francis et al, US 2002/70862). Denekamp et al (US 4750197) and Hannon et al (US 4688244) are cited to further show the state of the art.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mullen, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-2965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu, can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

TJM

Thomas J. Mullen, Jr. Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2632